## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/772,887	CHIAM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	PIERRE-LOUIS DESIR	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN AMERICA.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	out prior to the data of filing a brief	مط لمصمعهم مطاعمه النب	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of the properties of the properties of the content of the properties of the prop</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or	istriction appear by materially rec	adding or antipinying tr	10 100000 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Pierre-Louis Desir/	/ロ	wayne D. Bost/	
Examiner, Art Unit 2617	Supervisory Patent Exa		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that neither Yamadera nor Landers teaches a two-dimensional navigational key configured as a single button including four sets of contact points, wherein the two-dimensional key is configured to select and perform an action corresponding to one of a plurality of sub-menu items of a sub-menu. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described previously, Yamadera does disclose a two dimemsional key (Figure 1, element 4). Landers, on the other hand Landers disclose a navigation routine stored in memory can be invoked to change the functionality. For example, pressing a down arrow (or another arrow) when the point of focus is on the last menu in a set of menus can move the point of focus to an item in that last menu. In contrast, pressing the same key or arrow when the point of focus is on a menu other than the last menu will simply move the point of focus to another menu (i.e., to another menu at the same hierarchical level). (Explicitly selecting a menu without a navigation routine as described is typically done by pressing a soft key with an appropriate label. For example, a user could scroll to a widget labeled "Buddy List" and then press a soft key labeled "ok"). In contrast to existing user interfaces, the exemplary system allows users to simply continue to scroll down once the Buddy List menu (if it is the last menu) is reached to move the point of focus to successive "buddies" in the Buddy List menu. Therefore, Landers discloses that both a menu and sub-menu items can be selected and indicated action may be performed on the selected item using the navigation key. Col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 19.

As can be seen above, one skilled in the art would unhesitatingly conceptualize that the navigation key, disclosed by Landers, may be utilized to select both a menu and sub-menu items, wherein indicated action may be performed on the selected item using the navigation key.

Examiner respectfully reminds applicants that broadly written claims are broadly interpreted by examiner. As such, the combination of Yamadera and landers reads on the claims as written.